EXHIBIT 249

	Page 1
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
0	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
2	SHERMAN DIVISION
4	
5	
٦	THE STATE OF TEXAS, et al,
6	IIII BIAIL OI ILAAB, CC al,
O	Plaintiffs,
7	
	-vs- Civil Action No.
8	4:20-cv-00957-SDJ
	GOOGLE LLC,
9	
	Defendant.
10	
11	
12	VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF CHUCK HARDER
13	TAKEN ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANT
14	ON MAY 1, 2024, BEGINNING AT 8:51 A.M.
15	VIA ZOOM
16	
17	
	APPEARANCES
18	
1.0	on behalf of the PLAINTIFFS
19	Ma Amanda Hanta (Nia Farm)
20	Ms. Amanda Wentz (Via Zoom)
20	ARKANSAS ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
21	323 Center Street
21	Suite 200 Little Rock, Arkansas 72201
22	(501) 682-2007
23	(301) 002-2007
24	(Appearances continued on next page.)
25	REPORTED BY: Shannon S. Harwood, CSR, RPR, CRR
20	Job No. CS6663791

```
Page 2
     (Appearances continued.)
 1
     Mr. Clark Kirkland (Via Zoom)
 2.
     Ms. Rebecca Hartner (Via Zoom)
     SOUTH CAROLINA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
 3
     Rembert Dennis Building
     1000 Assembly Street
 4
     Room 519
     Columbia, South Carolina 29201
 5
     (803) 734-3970
     ckirkland@scaq.qov
 6
 7
     Mr. Jonathan Wilkerson (Via Zoom)
     THE LANIER LAW FIRM
 8
     10940 West Sam Houston Parkway N
     Suite 100
 9
     Houston, Texas 77064
     (713) 659-5200
10
     j.wilkerson@lanierlawfirm.com
11
12
     on behalf of the DEFENDANT
     Mr. Matthew Zorn (Via Zoom)
13
     Mr. Chuck Matula (Via Zoom)
     YETTER COLEMAN LLP
14
     811 Main Street
     Suite 1400
15
     Houston, Texas 77002
     (713) 632-8000
16
     mzorn@yettercoleman.com
     cmatula@yettercoleman.com
17
18
19
     ALSO APPEARING: Mr. Peter Zierlein, Videographer (Via
     Zoom) Mr. Dan Acosta, Video Concierge (Via Zoom)
2.0
21
22
23
24
25
```

	Page 23
1	VIDEO CONCIERGE: Got it. Will do.
2	A. Okay.
3	Q. (By Mr. Zorn) Sir, can you verify for me that
4	the date of this is April 1st, 2023?
5	A. That's correct.
6	Q. And so the State of Arkansas has been paying
7	Google over a decade for this ad campaign, fair?
8	A. Correct.
9	Q. And that's because, as we discussed earlier,
10	this ad campaign is in public interest, fair?
11	A. Yes, that's correct.
12	Q. And it's been effective, true?
13	A. It has it has achieved our goal, which is
14	to inform individuals who conduct internet searches
15	based on the criteria that we've set forth in in
16	giving them the opportunity to see that their purchase
17	or a purchase of untaxed cigarettes may be subject to
18	criminal or civil enforcement by the State of Arkansas.
19	Q. And at no point during this period has the
20	Office of Attorney General considered switching to a
21	different ad tech provider, correct?
22	A. Not to my knowledge.
23	MR. ZORN: Why don't we pull this this
24	document down.
25	O. (By Mr. Zorn) Sir, would you agree with me

Page 24

that the harm to Arkansas's general welfare and economy is based on publishers and advertisers experiencing decreased revenue, lower quality and higher prices?

MS. WENTZ: Form.

A. Pardon?

2.2

- Q. (By Mr. Zorn) Would you agree to me that the harm to Arkansas's general welfare and economy from what it alleges Google is doing in this case is based on harm that publishers and advertisers are experiencing in the form of decreased revenue, lower quality and higher prices?
- A. I don't think that I -- we can make that determination yet. We are still waiting for additional information to be provided during the discovery process and are waiting on the reports of our experts.
- Q. But that's Arkansas's allegation in the case, true?
- A. Again, we're not -- we're not going to know what the harm is to Ark -- Arkansans in the State of Arkansas until the discovery process is completed and we have the reports of our expert witnesses.
- Q. So -- so it's fair to say that the State of Arkansas joined this lawsuit not knowing one way or the other whether what it's alleging benefits Arkansas consumers or hurts Arkansas consumers; is that right?

800-567-8658 973-410-4098

Page 25

- A. No, we joined the lawsuit -- we joined the lawsuit. The harm -- the harm is a harm nationwide that we believe to be substantial and widespread and we believe that the harm to Arkansans was -- we have no reason to believe that the harm to Arkansans is any different than the national harm to -- national harm.
- Q. But so -- so setting aside national harm, the harm to Arkansans, has Arkansas done any evaluation as to whether the relief it is requesting in this case would benefit citizens of the State of Arkansas or take away from the state --
 - A. We've not done --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- Q. -- citizens of Arkansas?
- A. Yeah, as -- as I've indicated, we've not done a separate investigation or a separate evaluation and we will not know until the discovery has concluded and we get the reports of our experts.
- Q. Sir, the State has done no investigation, correct?
- A. We've not done any investigation apart from the multi-state investigation.
- Q. Sir, the State did no investigation before it decided to join this lawsuit as to whether obtaining the relief the State is requesting in this lawsuit would benefit Arkansans or would hurt Arkansans; is that

Veritext Legal Solutions 973-410-4098

UNDER PROTECTIVE ORDER

	Page 26
1	right?
2	A. We've not conducted any investigation separate
3	and apart from the multi-state investigation and have
4	relied upon the multi-state investigation and have as
5	our witness for that investigation designated Mr. Gordon
6	from Texas.
7	Q. Okay. When you speak of the multi-state
8	investigation, are you familiar with the multi-state
9	investigation?
10	A. I I know there's a multi-state
11	investigation that occurred before the filing of the
12	complaint.
13	Q. So you're aware of the existence of a multi-
14	state investigation, fair?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. Can you describe the multi-state investigation
17	for me now?
18	A. I don't know that I can do that without
19	divulging privileged information or communications or
20	protected attorney work product.
21	Q. Sir, the State is relying on the multi-state
22	investigation as a basis for its allegations in this
23	complaint, correct?
24	A Correct

Veritext Legal Solutions

25

Q.

And what you're telling me is that what the

800-567-8658 973-410-4098

Page 29

services cause publishers and advertisers to experience decreased revenue; yes or no?

A. If that is -- if that's what's in the complaint, then yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

- O. What is the basis for that belief?
- A. Yeah, on items -- or Item 29 of the complaint on Page 12, (As read) In sum, Google's anticompetitive conduct has adversely and substantially affected the Plaintiff State's economies, as well as the general welfare in the Plaintiff States. More particularly, Google's conduct has caused a wide range of anticompetitive effects as delineated in Section VIII. These effects include higher prices, reduced output, lower quality, reduced innovation, the exit of rivals, and foreclosed entry. Google's harm to competition deprives advertisers, publishers and their consumers of improved quality, greater transparency, greater innovation, increased output and lower prices.
 - Q. Is that what the state is relying on?
- A. That's our -- that's our allegation in the complaint and -- that's the allegation in our complaint.
- Q. Sir -- sir, that paragraph states a conclusion, correct?
 - A. I believe so.
- Q. What's the factual basis for that conclusion?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

Α.

Page 30

- The factual basis for that conclusion, this is -- this is an instance where -- again, an instance where the facts in this case are common for all the states involved and the fact witness for the common facts is the 30(b)(6) witness for the State of Texas, Mr. Gordon. Do you have any evidence about harm to Arkansas's citizens --Α. I don't have any -- I don't have any -- we don't have any evidence that the harm to Arkansas citizens is any different than the harm nationally. So -- so is it the State's contention that widespread national harm is the harm to Arkansas citizens? We -- no, the -- we do not believe -- we have no reason to believe that Arkansas was -- that the harm to Arkansas was any less or any more than it was nationally at this point. It will not know until discovery is concluded and we have the reports of our experts. Sir, discovery closes in two days. You know Q. that, right? Α. I do now. The fact discovery closes in two days, fair? Q.
 - Q. So -- so your testimony is that in the next 48

I have no reason to doubt that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

Page 31

hours, there may be new facts that -- that substantiate things that you can't substantiate today. Is that what I'm hearing?

- A. I don't believe that within the next 48 hours the information that we provide is going to be fully analyzed and the expert opinions are not due until the middle of May.
- Q. You believe that a deposition of the Texas DMV is going to assist you in determining the harm that is occurring to the citizens of the state of Arkansas?
- A. I have no reason to believe or not to believe that.
- Q. What discovery do you think will assist the State of Arkansas in determining whether its citizens have experienced particular harm from Google's conduct?
- A. We won't know until all the discovery is in and we get the report of our expert witnesses.
- Q. Sir, is there anything that has prevented the State from getting the opinion of its experts prior to now?
- A. I'm not -- I'm not familiar with that and I don't know -- I don't know that I can answer that question without divulging confidential information or privileged information or communications or privileged or protected attorney work product.

1	CERTIFICATE
2	Page 70
3	STATE OF OKLAHOMA)
4	COUNTY OF TULSA)
5	I, Shannon S. Harwood, a Certified Shorthand
6	Reporter in and for the State of Oklahoma, do hereby
7	certify that the foregoing is a true and correct
8	
9	transcription of my shorthand notes of proceedings had
10	in Case Number 4:20-cv-957-SDJ heard on the 1st day of
11	May, 2024, and is only valid with my stamped seal and my
12	original signature.
13	I further certify that I am not related to nor
14	attorney for either of said parties nor otherwise
15	interested in said action.
	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and
16	seal this 2nd day of May, 2024.
17	
18	
19	
20	A -01 0
21	Sannon Starwood
22	
23	
24	Shannon S. Harwood, CSR, RPR, CRR
25	